



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Handwritten signature

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/575,192	05/23/2000	Kia Silverbrook	NPA048US	9205

24011 7590 06/16/2004

SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD
393 DARLING STREET
BALMAIN, 2041
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER

GRANT II, JEROME

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Handwritten number 23

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/575,192

Applicant(s)

SILVERBROOK ET AL.

Examiner

Jerome Grant II

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-154 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 29-154 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

JEROME GRANT II
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

1. In the Amendment received Dec. 6, 2002, applicant has included claims 87 and 138 which are directed to claims that were withdrawn from consideration for the reasons presented in the communication of Sept. 12, 2002. The claims were drawn to subject matter not originally presented as part of claims 1-28.

The examiner's restriction requirement is clear and firm. Applicant is urged to see MPEP 819.

If applicant persists in the consideration of claims 29-154, which are directed toward matter that is independent and distinct from the invention of the originally presented claims, applicant should submit a petition as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.144.

Art Unit: 2626

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-12, 14-17 and 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lemelson.

With respect to claims 1 and 14 Lemelson teaches a method of providing a copy of at least one page of a printed document, the document including coded data (25) indicative of the identity of the document (21) and of at least one reference point of the document (right margin), the method including the steps of: receiving, in a computer system, (39N or 30) indicating data from a sensing device 39A, 39C - by a user (col. 5, lines 60-65) indicating the position of the sensing device relative to the document ; identifying the computer system (col. 5, lines 50-60) and a request for a copy of a page of a document (col. 6, lines 5-10); and transmitting, from the system relevant document data to at least a printer for effecting a print (col. 9, lines 42-51).

With respect to claims 2 and 15, Lemelson teaches a zone of a document (right margin) having information associated with the copy of a page and used to identify the zone where a sensing device is located. See figures 3 and 5.

With respect to claim 3, Lemelson teaches the receiving step as claimed in accordance with step 74 and 77 of figure 10. See also col. 4, lines 10-17. Lemelson teaches identification a request for copy in the zone. See sensing of magnetic information on sheet. See col. 4, lines 2227 and 37-42.

With respect to claim 4, Lemelson shows method using a printed document 21 with line coded data 25 indicative of a request including the steps of: receiving, a sensing device (39A, 39C) operated by a user (col. 5, lines 60-65) so that the document is positioned relative to the sensors (col. 4, lines 5--27); and transmitting relevant document data to effect printing, see col. 9, lines 42-51.

With respect to claim 5, Lemelson shows providing a copy of a page 21 with coded data 25 including the steps of receiving in a computer system a sensing device (39a, 39c) operated by a user (coll 5, lines 60-65) so that the documents move relative to the sensing device (col. 4, lines 5-27); interpreting a movement of a sensing device as designating the request (via microprocessor 30 or computer 39N); and transmitting relevant document data to at least one printer (see col. 9, lines 42-51).

Art Unit: 2626

With respect to claim 6, Lemelson teaches a method of copying at least one document 21 including coded data 25, the method including: receiving in a computer system (39N or 30) data from a sensing device 39A, 39C regarding IID of a user (user of printer having predetermined ID according to col. 4, lines 45-52), this information containing the ID of the user and the sensor of the computing device which identifies a document having the coded data 25; identifying document (Col 5, lines 50-60 and col. 6, lines 5-10) and transmitting relevant document data to a printer (see col. 9, lines 42-51). Print request data is addressed at col. 6, lines 6-14, see also col. 9, lines 40-50.

With respect to claim 7, the coded data appears in the margin of document 21 as data 25. Sensing device 39A and 39C reads the coded data.

With respect to claim 8, see col. 4, lines :5-27.

With respect to claim 9, see col. 9, lines 42-51.

With respect to claim 10, data exists on the magnetic strip. The data on the strip is invisible since it is digitally represented.

With respect to claim 11, the identification means is the microprocessor in accordance with col. 7, lines 9-15) which gives a unique identity of a user see also col. 4, lines 45-52.

Art Unit: 2626

With respect to claim 12, see col. 9, lines 40-50.

With respect to claim 16, see step 74 and 77 and fig. 10 of Lemelson. See also col. 4, lines 9-27.

With respect to claim 17, Lemelson teaches a computer system 39N or 30 for receiving data from sensors 39A or 39C by a user (col. 5, lines 50-60); the sensor sensing coded data 25 and the system making printed copies (see col. 9, lines 42-51)

With respect to claim 19, Lemelson teaches a system for printing documents 21 including coded data 25, the system including: a computer system 39N or 30 for sensing data (39A or 39C) regarding the identity of a user (see col. 5, lines 50-60) as the document is moved relative to the sensor. Lemelson teaches sensing data in the magnetic strip portion of 25; the computer system being configured to transmit relevant document using the coded data document data being sent to a printer as discussed at col. 4, lines 22-27 and 37-42.

With respect to claim 20, see col. 4, lines 20-27.

With respect to claim 21, see the sensing, devices 39A and 39C.

With respect to claim 22, Lemelson teaches the sensing device 39A and 39C recognizes marks on a magnetic nib.

Art Unit: 2626

With respect to claim 23, Lemelson teaches unique identity information for a user according to col. 3, line 60- col. 4, line 5. See also col. 4, lines 45-52.

With respect to claims 24-26 ,see col. 2, lines 10-15; col. 5, lines 52-55 and col. 9, lines 41-48.

With respect to claim 27, see the digital data recorded on the magnetic strip.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13, 18, 21, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson in view of the Well Known Prior Art 2144.03.

Regarding claims 13 and 28, Lemelson teaches all of the limitations upon which the claim depends except for binding the pages.

Art Unit: 2626

However, this limitation is obvious in view of printers which are well known to have a staple means. In other words, the printer makes the prints of a plurality of sheets and binds them by means of a stapler. This is a common feature with printer and copiers and would have been recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 18 and 21, Lemelson teaches all of the subject matter upon which the claim depends except for moving the sensing device relative to the document. See also col. 4, lines 2227 and 37-42.

Lemelson shows moving the document relative to the sensing means. Moving the sensing means relative to a document is well known in the art. Such is the case with bar code type readers, for example.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace or modify the scanner of Lemelson so that the sensor is moved relative to the document such as performed by references well known in the art, i.e., bar codes and other optical readers.

3. Response to Remarks/Arguments

Your items 1-5 are slightly incorrect. The case history reads as follows:

- 1) Notice regarding a Petition to make application Special was mailed April 6, 2001.
- 2) The First Office Action was a rejection mailed November 7, 2001. This office action rejected the only pending claims 1-28 over Lemelson.
- 3) An amendment sent by fax and received in the group on May 7, 2002. This amendment amended claims 1, 4, 5, 6 and 19 and added new claims 29-154.
- 4) Response to Office Communication received in the Patent Office June 19, 2002. Applicant encloses a check for \$1638.
- 5) Examiner mails a **Final Rejection** to the amendment received May 7, 2002. The Final Rejection rejected claims 1-28 and withdrew from consideration claims 29-154.

Art Unit: 2626

6) The Final Rejection mailed June 21, 2002 is withdrawn in view of a letter the office received June 19, 2002 which predated the first Final Rejection.

7) A Second Final Rejection, identical to the first, is resubmitted in view of the June 19, 2002 crossing in the mail with the first final rejection.

8) Applicant submitted **Amendment B** which was received in the Patent Office on October 23, 2002. This amendment amended claims 87 and 138.

9) Amendment B was treated as an Amendment After Final Rejection. Hence, an Advisory Action was mailed November 14, 2002. This Advisory Action denied entry of Amendment B.

10) Applicant filed an RCE received Dec. 6, 2002.

11) A first action rejection followed, which was mailed Jan. 21, 2003.

12) Applicant responds with an action received June 16, 2003.

13) The examiner submitted an office action in response to the June 16, 2003 amendment.

14) Applicant now responds to this communication.

With respect to the section of applicant's response titled "Current Claims", the examiner concurs that the claims in the Remarks/Arguments are the same as that considered by the examiner.

At the bottom of page 3, applicant argues that, "The issue I wish to focus on is the difference between the reproduced document being a copy of THE document that was used with the sensing device (the present invention as claimed), as opposed to merely being a copy of some other document that is different to the first document (Lemelson, for example). "

Applicant further argues that, "... Lemelson does not disclose production of a COPY of THE document that the sensing device interacts with in the first place. Applicant states that this is the crux of the invention.

However a closer view of claim 1, the claim applicant is arguing, does not recite, "...the copy of the document that the sensing device interacts within the first place..." Hence the crux of the invention is not in the claim as it is argued.

Claim 1 is so broad that it does not specifically state that a print document from a previously printed copy is performed.

Art Unit: 2626

The examiner submits that the difference that applicant is alleging between the claimed invention and Lemelson, is not specifically set forth in the claim. Hence, the broad recitation of the claim reads on Lemelson.

4.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2626

5.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Grant II whose telephone number is 703-305-4391. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams, can be reached on (703) 305-4863. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-3900.

J. Grant II

JEROME GRANT II
PRIMARY EXAMINER